

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 was objected to for reciting "control unit" wherein the claim from which claim 7 depends from refers to a "control module". This obvious error has been corrected, by changing to -- control module -- in claim 7.

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected as failing to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for apparently containing contradictory limitations concerning "storage capability". With respect to claim 1, the apparently contradictory limitation has been deleted, while in claim 10, the "storage capability" has been amended to -- persistent storage capability for a core dump --. No new matter has been added, see *e.g.*, the Specification as filed, pages 2-5 referring to an embodiment of the service module that does not have persistent storage, in contrast to a control module that does have persistent storage. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 1-25 stand rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,202,090 issued to Simone ("Simone"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection for the following reasons.

Beginning with claim 1, a method is recited in which a bootstrap program is loaded into an area of a memory of a service module that was occupied by a run time program. The bootstrap program is loaded after the service module is reset due to an error while executing the run time program. A memory image of the memory is captured using the bootstrap program, and sent to a control module. This control module is to receive captured memory images from one or more service modules. Simone does not disclose such a method.

In Simone, a core file is downloaded within a network device. In particular, the network device has main memory 18 storing the core file, and local flash memory 22 for storing router routines. After detecting a shutdown event, a shutdown routine 64 uses a flash core copy routine 67 (both in the flash memory 22) to download the contents of main memory 18 to local flash memory 22. The copy routine 67 also calls a

compression routine 66 that compresses the contents of main memory 18, before download to the local flash memory 22.

The network device also has a boot flash memory 24, which contains a boot program 65 to boot the operating routine 62 after a reset.

Note that the flash core copy routine 67 can alternatively copy part of the core file 61 (in main memory 18) into a portion of the boot flash memory 24 (core file #2).

However, the above cited portions of Simone do not disclose loading a bootstrap program into an area of a memory of a service module that was occupied by a run time program, where the bootstrap program is loaded after the service module is reset due to an error while executing the run time program. For example, the shutdown routine 64, the compression routine 66, and the flash core copy routine 67 are in a local flash memory 22, neither of which is taught or suggested as being loaded into an area of memory that was occupied by a run time program. In addition, neither the flash core copy routine 67 or the compression routine 66 appears to be loaded in said area of memory, after the router has been reset due to an error while executing a run time program.

The rejection of claim 1 should, therefore, be withdrawn.

As to claim 10, a computer readable medium with instructions which are executable by a system is recited where the instructions cause the system to load a bootstrap program into an area of a memory of a service module that was occupied by a run time program, where the service module does not have persistent storage capability for a core dump. In contrast, the router in Simone has a local flash memory 22 and boot flash 24 which store core file 68 and core file #2 69 (copied from main memory 18) by a flash core copy routine 67. This does not teach or suggest a service module that lacks persistent storage capability for a core dump. Accordingly, claim 10 is not anticipated by Simone for at least that reason.

Turning now to claim 19, this claim recites a system having a processor coupled with memory, configured by a bootstrap program to capture a memory image of the memory after the processor is reset when an error occurs while executing a run time

program. The bootstrap program is loaded into an area of the memory that is occupied by the run time program when the error occurs. Simone does not teach or suggest such a system.

In Simone, the shutdown routine 64, the compression routine 66, and the flash core copy routine 67 are in a local flash memory 22, neither of which is taught or suggested as being loaded into an area of memory that was occupied by a run time program. In addition, neither the flash core copy routine 67 or the compression routine 66 appears to be loaded in said area of memory, after the router has been reset due to an error while executing a run time program. Accordingly, this does not teach or suggest a processor configured by a bootstrap program to capture a memory image of the memory **after** the processor is reset when an error occurs while executing a run time program. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is requested.

Finally, claim 22 recites a system in means plus function format, including means for loading a bootstrap program into a first memory area of a memory means. This memory area is previously occupied by a run time program. The bootstrap program is loaded after a reset that is due to an error while executing the run time program. In Simone, however, the flash core copy routine is stored in the local flash memory and is not disclosed as being loaded into a memory area that is previously occupied by a run time program, much less disclose that a bootstrap program be loaded after a reset due to an error while executing a run time program. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is requested.

CONCLUSION

In sum, a good faith attempt has been made to address all of the points in the Office Action such that it is believed that claims 1-25, following entry of this amendment are in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.

02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 6, 2005

By 
Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. 42,261

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on April 6, 2005.


Margaux Rodriguez April 6, 2005